

# GEMS Workshop Delivery Report:

## Life-of-Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management:

*An Advanced Workshop for USAID/Middle East Regional Staff*

Held 18–21 May 2015 at  
USAID Mission, Cairo, Egypt



**8 June 2015**

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Arianne Neigh of The Cadmus Group, Inc.

Photo Credit: Arianne Neigh, GEMS Facilitator (Rod El Farag Water Treatment Facility, Cairo, Egypt)

# **GEMS Workshop Delivery Report: Life-of-Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design Management: *An Advanced Workshop for USAID/Middle East Regional Staff***

Held 18–21<sup>st</sup> May 2015 at  
USAID Mission, Cairo, Egypt

**Prepared by:**

Arianne Neigh, The Cadmus Group, Inc.  
[arianne.neigh@cadmusgroup.com](mailto:arianne.neigh@cadmusgroup.com)

**Prepared under:**

**The Global Environmental Management Support Project (GEMS II),**  
Award Number AID-OAA-M-13-00018. The Cadmus Group, Inc., prime  
contractor ([www.cadmusgroup.com](http://www.cadmusgroup.com)). GEMS II Activity ME03.

The Cadmus Group, Inc.  
100 Fifth Avenue, Suite 100  
Waltham, MA 02451 USA  
+1.617.673.7000 ■ Fax +1.617.673.7001  
[www.cadmusgroup.com](http://www.cadmusgroup.com)



**DISCLAIMER**

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

## CONTENTS

ACRONYMS .....	v
1. OVERVIEW .....	6
2. BACKGROUND .....	6
3. OBJECTIVES, AGENDA AND LEARNING APPROACH .....	7
Primary Objectives .....	7
Mission Training Needs Identified During Planning .....	7
Background: the Life-of-Project agenda.....	8
Specific Adaptations Made for the USAID/Middle East Regional Training Workshop Agenda.....	8
4. EVALUATIONS .....	9
5. CONCLUSIONS .....	10
Successes.....	10
Facilitators' Comments and Lessons Learned.....	11
6. SUPPORTING INFORMATION .....	12
Key training workshop attributes & implementation arrangements.....	12
Key Contacts.....	13
ATTACHMENT 1: AGENDA.....	14
ATTACHMENT 2: INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION INSTRUMENT .....	19

## ACRONYMS

ADS	Automated Directives Systems
A/COR	Agreement/Contracting Officer's Representative
BEO	Bureau Environmental Officer
BPR	Best Practice Review
CFR	Code of Federal (US) Regulations
DCHA	Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance
DO	Development Object (Formerly SO)
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMMP	Environmental Mitigation & Monitoring Plan
ENCAP	Environmentally Sound Design and Management Capacity-Building Support for Africa
ESDM	Environmentally Sound Design & Management
FAA	Foreign Assistance Act
GEMS	Global Environmental Management Support (Program)
IEE	Initial Environmental Examination
IP	Implementing Partner
ME	Bureau for the Middle East
MENA	Middle East North Africa
MEO	Mission Environmental Officer
OTI	Office of Transition Initiatives
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
REA	Regional Environmental Advisor
TDY	Temporary Duty
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

## I. OVERVIEW

In collaboration and with funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)/Bureau for the Middle East (ME), Global Environmental Management Support II (GEMS) delivered an advanced Life-of-Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design Management (ESDM) workshop for Regional Mission staff over 4 days, 18-21<sup>st</sup> May 2015, in Cairo, Egypt. Fourteen Mission staff from Yemen, Egypt, Jordan, South Sudan, and Gaza/West Bank attended, as well as four facilitators (GEMS, Regional Mission, and the USAID/Bureau for Democracy Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance [DCHA]) who conducted the workshop.

The workshop was delivered in an advanced format designed to balance technical topics with a review of the basic 22 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 216 process and Automated Directive Systems (ADS) 204 procedures so both staff new to environmental compliance and staff with a detailed understanding of 22 CFR 216 could benefit from the training. Therefore, the sessions had less focus on the basics of the Initial Environmental Examination (IEE) and Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) development, but relied more heavily on peer-to-peer sharing, mini-sessions that introduced advanced topics, and opportunities to put new topics into practice. Specifically, the workshop trained and refreshed participants in: (1) compliance with USAID's environmental procedures over life-of-project; (2) the objective of these procedures: ESDM of USAID-funded activities; and 3) special topics relevant to programming in the Middle East Region and for advanced practitioners of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

This report is not a proceedings document, but is intended to document the following elements of the training workshop:

- ❖ Learning approach and structure, as reflected in agenda, materials, and facilitation;
- ❖ Outcomes (including evaluations and issues for follow-up); and
- ❖ Conclusions.

## 2. BACKGROUND

Environmental Compliance is a mandatory requirement for all USAID-funded programs and activities. The Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) of 1961 requires that USAID consider impacts arising from USAID activities on the environment and that USAID include environmental sustainability as a central consideration in designing and carrying out its development programs. This mandate is implemented in 22 CFR 216 and USAID's ADS chapters 201 and 204, inter alia. Therefore, it is extremely important for staff and implementing partners (IPs) to be able to understand their requirements and roles and be empowered to implement and monitor the environmental implications of their programs.

It is good practice to offer initial training and refresher training every 3 to 5 years at each Mission. The advanced format regional training is generally offered annually. The last full workshop for the Middle East was conducted in Rabat, Morocco in March 2014. In Cairo, course attendants included Mission Environmental Officers (MEOs) and Deputy MEOs as well as Agreement/Contracting Officer's Representatives (A/CORs) who had not yet attended the initial ESDM training. The workshop was funded by the USAID/ME with the support of Mr. John Wilson (USAID/ME Bureau Environmental Officer [BEO]) and Ms. Alexandra Hadzi-Vidanovic (USAID/ME Regional Environmental Advisor [REA]). Ms. Emily Kunen, DCHA Post-Crisis Environmental Advisor, also facilitated the workshop and developed specific sessions on monitoring in a crisis context. Ms. Yasmine Farid, Training Coordinator, offered Mission support for material production, scheduling, and logistics. Mr. Atef Sayed and Ms. Soad Saada, (MEO Egypt) also assisted with local logistics, site visits, and planning.



### 3. OBJECTIVES, AGENDA AND LEARNING APPROACH

#### Primary Objectives

The primary objectives of the workshop were to assist USAID/ME mission staff to:

- A. Better understand and apply USAID Environmental Procedures (22 CFR 216, ADS 201, ADS 204) and documentation and review requirements;
- B. Design and implement environmentally-sound activities to improve program and project sustainability;
- C. Assess reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts and mitigation and monitoring tools to minimize adverse impacts and design errors;
- D. Consider answers to the questions: "How can environmentally sound design processes be strengthened within the Middle East Missions and the Agency?" and "What are some state-of-the-art approaches to mainstreaming environmental considerations into USAID regional and bilateral programs?";
- E. Introduce participants to advanced topics in EIA and the evolving theories and science behind best practice EIAs including indirect impacts, cumulative impacts, climate change implications, valuation of ecosystem services, and social considerations;
- F. Discuss capacity building needs, options, and approaches, and review new approaches to knowledge management and their potential application to Agency and Mission responsibilities to promote environmentally sound design; and
- G. Discuss issues of operating in dynamic and inaccessible contexts often affecting USAID programming in the Middle East.

#### Mission Training Needs Identified During Planning

Training needs were communicated by the REA and the Mission MEOs prior to the workshop. The facilitators relied on the Mission for preparation and planning during the workshop. The REA and the Post-Crisis Environmental Advisor assisted with updating materials and selecting the agenda.

The following training needs for the participants were identified:

1. Limited follow-through on EMMP development and planning.
2. Limited or lack of understanding on roles and responsibilities for environmental compliance reporting.
3. Understanding when it is appropriate and how to include social impacts and climate change into environmental compliance.
4. Challenges in determining how to develop environmental compliance documents at the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) stage and to meet schedule requirements for the PAD.
5. Understanding who clears on environmental compliance documents.
6. Proposed special topics to be addressed at the training workshop include:
  - ❖ Monitoring in Hard to Reach Environments
  - ❖ Construction
  - ❖ Investment Promotion
  - ❖ Ecosystem services
  - ❖ Cumulative Impacts
  - ❖ Indirect Impacts
  - ❖ Social Assessments

The program design, development, and subsequent delivery addressed these issues as reflected by the workshop agenda and materials.

## **Background: the Life-of-Project agenda.**

The first Life-of-Project workshop agenda and materials were piloted at a June 2008 workshop in Bagamoyo, Tanzania delivered under the ENCAP project.<sup>1</sup> That curriculum focused on environmental compliance and ESDM across the project lifecycle, and serves as the basis—along with similar content developed by Sun Mountain International—for the hybrid workshop developed under GEMS. This 2015 ME workshop agenda is specific to Middle East North Africa Region (MENA), but also adapts new format revisions from the March 2015, Africa Regional training held in Rwanda. Consistent with adult learning techniques, including a focus on practical application, the agenda reflects the principle that group exercises and field visits should represent at least 50 percent of total training time, if not more, and that classroom theory should be systematically reinforced with exercises and a field visit component. However, due to the slightly shortened nature of the workshop, the actual amount of time spent in group work was closer to 40 percent.

## **Specific Adaptations Made for the USAID/Middle East Regional Training Workshop Agenda**

- The workshop was delivered in 4 days instead of the standard 4.5 days at the request of the Mission. This required the elimination of certain field visits (the 4.5 day program usually includes two field visits) in exchange for the use of “virtual” field visits.
- Since a premier focus was to encourage participation, the agenda was adapted throughout the week to adjust for the pace of the group’s learning and their preference of topics. The goal was to ensure that participants could ask and receive attention to specific questions they brought to the workshop rather than strictly adhering to the agenda and materials.
- With a focus on practical application and with limited time to conduct a field visit, participants were led on a virtual field visit undertaken in Day 1. This afforded participants an opportunity to practice information gathering and develop observations skills needed to identify and prioritize potential environmental impacts or issues of concern, and discuss approaches to limit adverse effects on the environment. Ideally the field visit would have been based on a conflict sensitive topic from a DCHA Office of Transition Initiative (OTI) project, but the team could not obtain the materials from those managers.

A second integrated field study developed for the Rwanda workshop was utilized for this training rather than using one from the region specifically. The case study brought to practice advanced EIA topics such as indirect and cumulative impacts of a project, as well as consideration of social impacts, ecosystem services, and climate change.

- During a field visit to the Rod El Farag Water Treatment Facility, holding company, and reference lab, the participants practiced development of an EMMP from the IPs perspective. Back in the training room, they worked in teams to develop EMMPs for construction or operation and maintenance of the plant with critiques from the rest of the participants. The MEOs developed a Terms of Reference for a Scoping Assessment of the site with the goal of exposing other participants to this advanced topic. Scoping EAs and EAs were introduced in plenary. The goal was to work collaboratively to develop an EMMP and to understand the challenges IPs may face in development, as well as to critique EMMPs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Environmentally Sound Design and Management Capacity Building for Partners and Programs in Africa (ENCAP) was a program of USAID/AFR/SD implemented by International Resources Group, prime contractor, and The Cadmus Group, Inc., subcontractor via contract no. EPP-I-00-03-00013-00, Task Order No. 11. Additional information on the ENCAP program is available at [www.encapafrika.org/about.htm](http://www.encapafrika.org/about.htm)



## 4. EVALUATIONS

Two different formal methods were used to evaluate the success of the workshop in meeting its objectives. Both indicated that the workshop strongly achieved these objectives:

1. **Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Report Presentations.** Following the conclusion of EMMP development exercises based on the field visit to the water treatment plant on Day 3, a review of EMMPs was conducted in the form of presentations on Day 4. Small teams presented EMMPs in the role of IPs to an audience playing the role of A/COR who were charged with critiquing the EMMPs. This exercise gave USAID staff an opportunity to both provide and receive feedback on what comprises an effective EMMP and helped build an understanding of challenges that IPs face. While the exercise was easier for some groups with more experience in environmental compliance, those groups that do not frequently deal with engineering issues faced a greater challenge. For the most experienced, the exercise reinforced their critical thinking skills, and for the more novice groups, they showed a significantly higher level of understanding of what constitutes a quality EMMP than they did prior to the training.
2. **Individual Training Workshop Evaluation and Feedback Instrument.** At the conclusion of the workshop, participants were asked to complete an individual GEMS workshop evaluation form (attached). The form is designed to solicit evaluations of the learning approach and to differentiate evaluations according to the level of prior knowledge of participants.

The latter is intended to evaluate workshop performance against and inform future workshop design while simultaneously meeting the needs of both relatively experienced and novice participants in the areas of ESDM and USAID environmental procedures.

The tables below summarize the responses received. In all overall evaluation categories, the scores fall between “good” and “excellent.”

### A. Overall evaluation results:

Scoring scheme: 1=very poor; 2=poor; 3= acceptable; 4=good; 5=excellent

Evaluation Element	Cairo 2015	Previous training workshops in the series Average scores for all participants		
		Morocco 2014**	Senegal 2014**	Bangkok 2013**
Technical Program	4.38	4.64	4.33	4.04
Facilitation	4.19	4.44	4.14	4.56
Logistics	4.31	4.45	3.22	4.52
Venue	4.31	4.22	2.95	4.69
Field Visits	4.31	4.18	4.14	4.52

\*\*regional workshops

### B. Impact

Scoring scheme: 1=not at all increased; 2=moderately increased; 3=strongly increased

Evaluation Element	Average Score*	Interpretation
Empowerment	2.38	Nearly all participants identified that their motivation increased.
Motivation	2.46	

\*average across all participants. The average self-evaluated “baseline knowledge” of participants prior to attending the workshop was 1.92 out of 3, where: 1=Had poor or limited understanding of ESDM and USAID’s

Environmental Procedures; 2 = Understood the basics, lacked some details; 3 = Had a strong and detailed understanding.

### C. Learning Approach

Scoring scheme: varies by element, see column in table, 3 is the ideal score in all cases

Evaluation Element	Scoring scheme	Average Scores	Interpretation
Field vs. Classroom balance	1=much more time in the field needed 3=right balance; 5=much more time in the classroom needed	2.58	Overall participants indicated that they would like to see a longer training with more time in the field. They felt that some aspects had to be rushed in the 4 day format.
Presentations vs. Exercises balance	1=much more emphasis on presentations needed 3=right balance; 5=much more exercise/discussion time needed	3.23	
Technical level and pace	1=too heavy; 3=about right 5=too light	2.84	
Opportunities for peer exchange	1=need to hear much more from facilitators 3=right balance; 5=need much more peer learning	3.15	

\*average across respondents

### D. High rated/low-rated sessions

Participants were asked to identify the one or two sessions they rated most highly and least highly, for content, usefulness, approach, or other reasons. About 75% of participants completed this section.

#### Highest-rated

1. Generally, the highest-rated sessions focused on the development and use of the EMMPs as participants thought that these sessions related closely to their work (Session 7 and site visit)
2. The Effective IEE exercise in which we reviewed an existing IEE that was seeded with problematic mistakes was also a highly rated session (Session 6)
3. One participant noted that they enjoyed the use of the integrated case study to tie together the advanced concepts introduced on Day 2 that include cumulative impacts, environmental services, etc. (Session 10)

#### Lowest-rated

1. Only one respondent noted a lowest rated session:
  - a. Session 7: Downstream Compliance; and
  - b. Session 10: Integrative Case Study.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

### Successes

1. USAID staff identified that they had a greater understanding of the IEE and how to develop EMMPs.
2. The field visit generally received high scores, although it would have been better to have more information to pre-plan for the visit and provide that to participants.
3. The ad-hoc review session at the end was well-received as a wrap-up and reminder of what we had learned during the week. It was a good lead into the stocktaking exercise and the participants were

highly engaged and taking notes. It also acted as an avenue for participants to ask their final questions for the workshop.

4. A short discussion of the Best Practice Review (BPR) was given and the MEOs and Deputy MEOs from the region were very interested. We provided them with the new Draft standards and factsheet information for a BPR.
5. The format with the mini-sessions and poster sessions allowed for some flexibility given audience interest. For example, we added a presentation on Development Objective (DO) or PAD level IEEs at the request of the participants and spent additional time on monitoring in hard to access locations and Programmatic Environmental Assessments (EAs) and IEEs (or tricky applications of Reg 216, as it was called by the participants).

## Facilitators' Comments and Lessons Learned

1. The training was intended to be an advanced workshop; however, at least half of the participants were really "beginners", which was challenging because some material was too technical for them but other material was too much of a review for the advanced group. The facilitators tried to strike a balance, but with that, both groups were not receiving the full intended impact of the training.

**Lesson Learned:** Consider adding a two-day introduction course or an online component onto the beginning of the advanced Regional workshop formats to bring Mission staff with only cursory knowledge up to speed before beginning advanced material.

2. The training would have benefited from a few more examples directly from the Middle East. While we had one example that we used in the Session 6 IEEs, most other examples came from material developed for Africa Bureau. However, GEMS was not tasked with the development of these new materials under the scope of work.

**Lesson Learned:** GEMS will look for future opportunities to develop ME focused case studies while conducting other activities in the region.

3. Because the site visit was a construction project and the virtual field visit and integrative case study were based on an irrigation system, participants dealing in more abstract applications of environmental compliance such as financial mechanisms, felt these applications were not being addressed. However, sessions dealing with financial mechanisms had to be skipped because of the tardiness of the participants. We did realize the examples did not span the full breadth of USAID programming, such as the health sector or economic growth, so we presented examples of these later in the training to compensate.

**Lessons Learned:** Pay close attention to the sectors of the examples used and strategically attempt to use examples from each sector throughout the week.

4. While the logistics and venue scores were high compared to other trainings, (which is to the credit of Ms. Yasmine Farid who was instrumental in supporting the training) having the training at the Mission led to tardiness of the participants on numerous occasions as they tended to meetings and other activities in the Mission. The tardiness was highly disruptive and set the schedule back to where we had to eliminate or drastically abbreviate at least two sessions. At least one participant indicated that they thought an external venue, perhaps in Sharm el Sheikh, would have been a better selection.

**Lessons Learned:** If possible, it is preferable to hold trainings outside of the Mission to avoid participants focusing on too many outside duties.

## 6. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

### Key training workshop attributes & implementation arrangements

#### Place, Date and Participants

Dates	18–21 May 2015
Venue	USAID Mission, Cairo, Egypt
Participants	14 USAID Staff, 4 facilitators (15 final evaluations received).  <b>Training workshop team:</b> USAID: See “USAID Environmental Officers/Advisors” below GEMS: Two facilitators and 2 support staff. See “GEMS training workshop team,” below
Working language	English

#### Staffing and Logistics

Planning and coordination	GEMS team, USAID/ME REA, DCHA Post-Crisis Advisor, USAID/Egypt Training Coordinator, Ms. Yasmine Farid, and Mr. Atef Sayed coordinated logistics for the training workshop, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invitations to attendees and LMS posting</li> <li>• Electronic Country Cables</li> <li>• Hotel Bookings for TDYers and airport transfer</li> <li>• Coffee and Tea Service</li> <li>• Motor Pool</li> <li>• Site Visit</li> </ul>
GEMS Training Workshop Team	<b>Arianne Neigh</b> (Cadmus, GEMS) served as lead trainer. <b>Michael Minkoff</b> (Cadmus, GEMS) served as lead trainer.  The lead GEMS trainers had responsibility for day-to-day workshop delivery, material collection and sourcebook printing as well as daily reviews and group facilitation. The facilitation team met at the end of each day to review and strategize as well as adapt materials. The lead trainers were also responsible for managing flow and time and organizing group work.
USAID Environmental Officers/Advisors	<b>Alexandra Hadzi-Vidanovic</b> , the USAID/ME REA supported material preparation, workshop facilitation, and logistics. <b>Emily Kunen</b> , USAID/DCHA Post-Crisis Advisor supported training workshop facilitation, developed materials, and presented sessions.

#### Contracts, Funding, and Cost-Shares

Cost shares and funding sources	USAID participants’ respective missions/offices covered their travel and per diem.  USAID/ME buy-in to GEMS II covered labor and travel of the GEMS workshop team, GEMS home office support, and workshop materials. USAID/Egypt provided logistics support, venue, motor pool, and coffee and tea break.
Contract mechanisms	USAID/ME buy-in to GEMS II.

#### Agenda, Content, and Materials

Development lead	Michael Minkoff and Arianne Neigh (Cadmus, GEMS)
Agenda	The final agenda is attached. See notes on agenda below.
Hardcopy materials	Participants were provided with the following materials in hardcopy: <b>Sourcebook.</b> 1.5” 3-ring binder x 20 containing the agenda, a brief objectives statement/overview of each module, presentations, and exercises.

	The sourcebooks were reproduced in the U.S. by Cadmus and then shipped to Cairo. One box of 10 binders was held at customs in Cairo and never recovered. The Mission produced the additional sourcebook copies as well as material not developed in time for shipping.
Memory sticks (flash drives)/MEO Resource Center	Participants were provided with flash drives with offline copies of the GEMS website, sourcebooks as well as links to presentations. Sourcebook material will be posted to the GEMS website. Participants will be notified of the website location via email.
Virtual site visits	The training workshop was limited to 4 days so the team, in conjunction with USAID, opted to conduct a virtual field visit for participant group exercises as well as one actual site visit.
Materials archive	Materials are archived on the GEMS website ( <a href="http://www.usaidgems.org">www.usaidgems.org</a> )

## Key Contacts

Organization	Name & Position	Contact Info
USAID/ME	John Wilson, BEO	jwilson@usaid.gov
USAID/ME	Alexandra Hadzi-Vidanovic, REA	ahadazi@usaid.gov
CADMUS/GEMS	Mark Stoughton, GEMS Team Leader	mark.stoughton@cadmusgroup.com
	Arianne Neigh, Facilitator	arianne.neigh@cadmusgroup.com
	Michael Minkoff, Facilitator	mminkoff@cadmusgroup.com
	Tara Fortier, Senior Analyst	tara.fortier@cadmusgroup.com
	Jodi O'Grady, Senior Analyst	jodi.ogrady@cadmusgroup.com

## ATTACHMENT I:AGENDA

### Life-of-Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management

A Middle East Regional Training Workshop for USAID Staff  
Cairo, Egypt  
18–21 May 2015

#### Overall Goal & Objectives:

The overall goal of the workshop is to strengthen environmentally sound design and management of USAID-funded activities in the Middle East by assuring that participants have the motivation, and knowledge and skills *beyond the introductory level* necessary to: (1) achieve environmental compliance over the life environmentally and programmatically complex projects; and (2) otherwise integrate environmental considerations in project and activity design and management to improve overall project acceptance and sustainability.

#### Overview:

- Day 1 MOTIVATION, CORE EIA CONCEPTS AND SKILLS, PRE-IMPLEMENTATION COMPLIANCE
- Day 2 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE DURING PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, ADVANCED IMPACT ASSESSMENT
- Day 3 FIELD VISITS AND GROUP WORK
- Day 4 CONFLICT/POST-CONFLICT SETTINGS & SECTORAL BEST PRACTICE; BRINGING TRAINING TO REALITY



Day/Time	Module	Objective/Content Summary
Sun 17 May	ARRIVAL	
6:00 -	Welcome Reception/Dinner	
Mon 18 May	MOTIVATION, CORE EIA CONCEPTS AND SKILLS, PRE-IMPLEMENTATION COMPLIANCE	
8:00 – 8:30.	Registration	
8:30 – 8:45	Welcome & Opening Statements	
8:45 – 9:15	<b>Session 1: Intro &amp; Objectives</b>	Articulate workshop plans, objectives, goals, and participants' introductions and expectations. Review the agenda and logistics.
9:15 – 10:00	<b>Session 2: Environmental Compliance for Environmentally Sound Design &amp; Management</b>	Achieve a common understanding of “environment.” Summarize the legal basis of USAID’s environmental procedures and the life-of-project requirements they establish.
	<i>Part A: Presentation</i>	With illustrations by example, understand the need for such procedures to systematically address environmental issues in development activities—even for activities not primarily focused on “biophysical interventions”
	<i>Part B: Participant Examples, Brief Discussion</i>	
10:00 – 10:15	Break	
10:15 – 11:00	<b>Session 3: EIA Concepts, Process &amp; Skills, Part I</b>	USAID’s Environmental Procedures are a specific implementation of the general EIA process. Understanding USAID’s procedures requires understanding the general EIA process.
	<i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i>	Define key concepts —baseline, impact, activity; brief the EIA process; and learn essential classroom theory for baseline characterization, impact identification & mitigation design and how they apply in the EIA framework. We also establish how the EIA process is a framework for achieving ESDM.
11:00 – 12:10	<b>Session 4: Reg. 216: USAID’s pre- implementation EIA Process</b>	Review USAID’s implementation of the EIA process and the preparation of project environmental compliance documents; understand how these documents establish environmental management criteria for USAID-funded activities.
	<i>Includes break for prayer</i>	
	<i>Technical presentation and dialogue</i>	
12:10 – 12:25	<b>Session 5: Virtual Field Exercise: Practicing EIA Skills</b>	Practice observation skills needed to characterize the baseline situation and identify impacts/issues of concern
	<i>Part A: Briefing</i>	
12:25 – 13:25	Lunch	
13:25 – 14:10	<b>Part B: Virtual Field Visit</b>	Synthesize field observations and prioritize impacts/issues of concern; discuss possible approaches for limiting adverse effects on the environment.
14:10 – 15:20	<b>Part C: Group Work &amp; Plenary Synthesis</b>	Synthesize field observations and prioritize impacts/issues of concern; discuss possible approaches for limiting adverse effects on the environment.
15:20 – 15:35	Break ( <i>Includes break for prayer</i> )	
15:35 – 16:00	<b>Session 6: Effective IEEs</b>	Initial Environmental Examinations (IEEs) are USAID’s version of the <i>preliminary assessment</i> and the most common type of Reg. 216 documentation.
	<i>6a: Briefing: IEE Review Criteria, Common gaps</i>	

Day/Time	Module	Objective/Content Summary
		This session will brief the characteristics of effective IEEs, summarize common shortfalls from the BEO/REA perspective
16:00 – 16:30	6b: Review, Group Feedback/Discussion	Draft revised IEE templates will be reviewed in-depth in facilitated small group format and feedback provided.
Tues 19 May	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE DURING PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, ADVANCED IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
8:00 – 8:15	Day 1 review & Day 2 prospectus	
8:15 – 09:30	Session 7: EIA Skills Part II: & “Downstream” compliance: Monitoring, EMMPs & Reporting  Part A: Technical presentation and dialogue	Review the objective and key principles of environmental monitoring and indicator selection.  Understand EMMP purpose, concept and formats and introduce a key resource: AFR’s EMMP Factsheet. Understand ME expectations regarding IP environmental compliance reporting, and the EMMP as the basis for such reporting.
09:30 – 10:15	Part B: Conditions to Actions: Small Group Exercise	Practice key EMMP skills: translating IEE conditions to specific mitigation actions.
10:15 – 10:30	Break	
10:30 – 11:00	Session 8: EA & PEA Basics  Technical presentation and dialogue	Understand how USAID Environmental Procedures apply in situations where activities present the potential for significant adverse impacts. Discuss the process and expertise needed to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA), and meaningful alternatives analysis and consultation as the core of the process.
11:00 – 11:10	Session 9: Impact Assessment “201”  Part A: Orientation	In a series of 15 minute mini-briefings, this session introduces a set of key concepts in impact assessment beyond the introductory level. These concepts are then explored in the integrative case study that follows.
11:10 – 11:25	Part B: Cumulative Impacts	
11:25 – 11:40	Part C: Indirect Impacts	
11:40 – 12:05	Part D: Ecosystem Services  Includes break for prayer	
12:05 – 12:20	Part E: Social Impacts	
12:20 – 13:20	Lunch	
13:20 – 13:35	Part F: GCC & impact assessment	
13:35 – 15:25	Session 10: Integrative Case Study(ies)	In small groups, discuss case study briefing materials and identify cumulative, indirect & social impacts, and GCC and ecosystem services issues. Discuss how USAID should approach programming under regional development plans/initiatives to deliver long-term benefits and not worsen unforeseen impacts.
15:25 – 15:40	Break  Includes break for prayer	
15:40 – 16:00	Session 11: Field-based EMMP Exercise	Over this extended session, we will work in small groups to develop an EMMP. The EMMP will respond to a project scenario and be informed by field visit(s) we undertake at the beginning of Day 3.

Day/Time	Module	Objective/Content Summary
<i>Part A: Site &amp; Exercise Briefing</i>		
16:00 – 16:30	<i>Part B: Group Preparation</i>	Groups view briefing materials and discuss overall approach/strategy
<b>Wed 20 May</b>	<b>FIELD VISITS AND GROUP WORK</b>	
8:00 – 13:00 (includes return)	<i>Part C: Field Visits</i>	Groups complete site visits
<b>Return – 14:15</b>	<b>Lunch &amp; Freshen up</b>	
14:30 – 16:30 (coffee break taken at leisure) <i>Includes break for prayer</i>	<i>Part D: Field visit exercises/develop presentations. (Group work)</i>  <i>BEOs available for “office hours” from 16:00 for any groups that may finish early.</i>	Small groups will synthesize findings and observations from the field visits, working to develop key content of an EA SOW and a memo to the design team providing environmental and social design/mitigation guidance to be taken on board.  Groups will be ready to present first thing on Thursday morning.
<b>Thurs 21 May</b>	<b>CONFLICT/POST-CONFLICT SETTINGS &amp; SECTORAL BEST PRACTICE; BRINGING TRAINING TO REALITY</b>	
8:00 – 8:15	Day 3 review & Day 4 prospectus	
8:15 – 09:30	<i>Part E: Group Presentations</i>	Working groups present their document/findings and recommendations in approx. 20-minute presentations with feedback from facilitators.
<b>09:30 – 09:45</b>	<b>Break</b>	
09:45 – 10:45	<b>Session 12: Environmental Management in Conflict and Post-Conflict Settings</b>  <i>Presentation, Q&amp;A</i>	
10:45 – 10:50	<b>Session 13: Sector “poster sessions”</b> <i>Part A: Introduction</i>	Briefings on sector-specific new developments and current issues in the area of ESDM and environmental compliance
10:50 – 11:00	<i>Part B: Monitoring in hard-to-access locations</i>	
11:00 – 11:10	<i>Part C: Best Practice and Compliance for Investment Promotion</i>	
11:10 – 11:20	<i>Part D: Construction</i>	
11:20 – 12:10 <i>Includes break for prayer</i>	<b>Sector 14: Sector Roundtables</b> <i>Breakout format</i>	Sector roundtables correspond to the “poster sessions” immediately above, and are informal discussions/Q&A with a BEO/subject expert. Participants chose which roundtable to join.
12:10 – 13:10	<b>Lunch</b>	
13:10 – 13:55	<b>Session 15 Roles, Responsibilities &amp; Resources</b> <i>Half of session time is reserved for Q&amp;A</i>	Review Environmental Compliance roles and responsibilities, with reference to ADS requirements & the programming cycle. Introduce the key resources available to support environmental compliance and ESDM.
13:55 – 14:35	<b>Session 16: “Parking Lot”</b>	Address unresolved questions with reference to the issues and questions “parking lot” created over the course of the workshop.
<b>14:35 – 14:45</b>	<b>Break</b>	

Day/Time	Module	Objective/Content Summary
14:45 – 16:00 <i>Includes break for prayer</i>	<b>Session 17: Stocktaking &amp; Action Plans</b>	Work individually and in small groups to develop: (1) key issues/items to communicate to mission/team management after the workshop; (2) individual action plans.
16:00 – 16:15	<b>Session 18: Evaluations</b>	
16:15 – 16:45	<b>Certificates and Closing</b>	

## ATTACHMENT 2: INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

### Workshop Evaluation

#### Life-of-Project Environmental Compliance and Environmentally Sound Design and Management

#### A Middle East Regional Advanced Training Workshop for USAID Staff

Cairo, Egypt ▪ 18–21 May 2015

*Your frank and honest feedback will help strengthen future trainings and help prioritize ESDM and environmental compliance support to USAID Programs and Missions in the Middle East and globally. Thank-you for your time!*

### Learning approach

For each issue, please check the assessment you most agree with

Issue	Assessment					Comments
<b>Balance of time in classroom to time in field</b>	Much more time in field needed	A bit more time in field needed	About right	A bit more time in classroom needed	Much more time in classroom needed	
<b>In the classroom, balance of presentations to exercises, group work &amp; discussions</b>	Much more emphasis on presentations needed	A bit more emphasis on presentations needed	About right	A bit more emphasis on exercises/ discussions needed	Much more emphasis on exercises/ discussions needed	
<b>Technical level &amp; pace</b>	Much too heavy	A little too heavy	About right	A bit too light	Much too light	
<b>Opportunities for peer exchange &amp; learning</b>	Needed to hear and learn much more directly from facilitators	Needed to hear and learn more directly from facilitators	About right	Some more opportunities for peer learning/ exchange are needed	Many more opportunities for peer learning/exchange are needed	

### Highest/Lowest-rated sessions

Please identify the 1 or 2 sessions that you rate most highly (for content, usefulness, approach or for other reasons). Please also identify the 1 or 2 sessions that you found least engaging/useful/relevant. Please briefly indicate the reasons for your choice. (You may wish to refer to the agenda to refresh your memory.)

Session	Comment (Please explain why you made this choice.)
<b>HIGH-RATED</b>	
<b>HIGH-RATED</b>	
<b>LOW-RATED</b>	
<b>LOW-RATED</b>	

**Overall evaluations Please check the assessment you most agree with.**

Issue	Assessment					Comments
	Very poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	
Technical quality (Program & Content)						
Facilitation						
Logistics						
Venue						
Field visits						

**Pre-workshop Knowledge of Env Compliance/ESDM Please circle the characterization you most agree with.**

Question	Characterization			Comments
<b>Baseline Knowledge</b> In light of what you have learned in this workshop, how would you rate your understanding of ESDM and USAID's Environmental Procedures BEFORE this workshop?	Had poor or limited understanding	Understood the basics, lacked some details	Had a strong and detailed understanding	

**Impact Please circle the characterization you most agree with.**

<b>Knowledge and Skills</b> To what extent has this workshop increased your <u>knowledge and skills</u> to address environmental compliance requirements in the context of your job function/professional responsibilities?	Not at all	Moderately	Strongly	
<b>Motivation</b> To what extent has this workshop increased your <u>motivation</u> to <i>proactively</i> address environmental compliance and ESDM in the context of your job function/professional responsibilities?	Not at all	Moderately	Strongly	

**Key topics not covered**

Were there any topics of key importance to you that were not covered/given very limited attention?	
--	--

**Support needs**

Are there particular environmental compliance/ESDM support needs or resources that you require?	
---	--

**Additional comments welcome on any topic.**